determined so that the correction quantity becomes smaller as the vehicle speed becomes higher.

With these recited features of a vehicle speed control, the degree of correction of the command vehicle speed is decreased as the vehicle speed increases. This arrangement, therefore, enables the vehicle speed control system to better ensure a vehicle stability and to prevent the driver from having a strange feeling with respect to the control by the vehicle speed control system.

These recited features are not disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art. *First*, Suzuki relates to a *chassis dynamometer* control system and is not a *vehicle* speed control system or method, for a vehicle as recited in the pending independent claims 11 and 14.

Second, nowhere does Suzuki disclose calculating a correction quantity according to a lateral acceleration of the vehicle. In fact the Suzuki patent does not even mention lateral acceleration. Furthermore, in a chassis dynamometer, significant lateral acceleration is generally not generated or accounted for. Therefore, there is no mention of lateral acceleration in the Suzuki patent and, furthermore, combination of lateral acceleration from another reference would be meaningless in the context of Suzuki's chassis dynamometer since lateral acceleration is generally not generated or accounted for in a chassis dynamometer.

Third, the independent claims recite a command vehicle speed variation determining section (or corresponding step in claim 14) that determines the correction quantity so that the correction quantity becomes smaller as the vehicle speed becomes higher. No such relationship between the correction quantity and vehicle speed is disclosed or suggested by Suzuki. Specifically, the follow-up correction unit 15 of the Suzuki modifies a *command torque* supplied to the torque control circuit 17 but does not teach or suggest the claimed correction quantity becoming smaller as the *vehicle speed* becomes higher.

Furthermore, the deficiencies of Suzuki are not cured by Tohda. Accordingly, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the pending claims. Therefore, since neither the features nor the advantages of the claimed invention are disclosed by the applied prior art, the pending claims are patentable over the applied prior art.

The dependent claim 12 is also allowable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claim on which it ultimately depends. In addition, it recites additional patentable features as already indicated in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If there are any questions regarding the application, or if an examiner's amendment would facilitate the allowance of one or more of the claims, the examiner is courteously invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 13, 2004 (Monday)

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Richard L. Schwaab
Registration No. 25,479

Aaron C. Chatterjee
Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicants